

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, my district is a rural district in the State of Colorado, the Third Congressional District of Colorado. That congressional district actually is geographically larger than the State of Florida.

I can tell my colleagues, it is very important out there in the rural areas of Colorado, as it is through most of the rural areas in the United States, that we have TV reception. We have become very dependent of late upon satellite reception. As many of my colleagues know, for the last 11 or so years, local access has been banned through satellite.

Well, we are about to change that. We passed a bill out of the House. The Senate has passed a bill. I have good news tonight for those of my colleagues who have constituents who use satellite service for local access. Things are about to change.

The conference committee I think is making good progress. I hope that, in the next 3 to 4 weeks, the satellite users, including many of my constituents in the State of Colorado, will once again have an opportunity for local access.

EXHIBIT AT BROOKLYN MUSEUM OF ART

Mr. MCINNIS. The second point I wish to address this evening, Mr. Speaker, is the art exhibit in New York City, the Brooklyn Art Museum. I made some comments about that last week. I am amazed how over the weekend the media has been very successful in tying the exhibit, and I will tell my colleagues exactly what it is, a portrait of the Virgin Mary with crap thrown all over it, to be quite blunt with you. They have made this controversy in New York City as if it is a controversy between the freedom of speech under the Constitutional amendment and people who were offended by the art.

That is not the controversy at all. The controversy in New York City in that museum is that the taxpayers of the United States of America are being asked to pay for this art exhibit at the Brooklyn Museum.

Now, do my colleagues think it is appropriate for someone who is a taxpayer, who is a hard-working American, who is a Catholic to go out and take their taxpayer money to pay for a portrait to be exhibited of the Virgin Mary with crap thrown all over it? Of course it is not. It is as offensive to the Catholics as it is displaying a Nazi symbol by taxpayer dollars would be to the Jewish community, or as it would be of putting a portrait of Martin Luther King with crap thrown all over it to the black community.

It is out of place. It is unjustified. And it is totally, totally inappropriate for the use of taxpayers' dollars for that kind of art.

Now, that is not an issue of the first amendment. Nobody has said that they cannot display that type of art, al-

though, frankly, I think they are somewhat sick in the mind when they do. But no one has said that they are banned from displaying that type of art.

Instead, what we have said is they should not use taxpayers' dollars to fund that kind of art. This museum, with a great deal of pride, had their first showing this weekend; and today they announced with great excitement, and I hope it makes my liberal Democrats happy, they announced with great excitement how successful that show is.

Well, in their hearts, they know it is wrong. They know it is wrong to do what they have done with taxpayer dollars. And in the end, we will win. We will keep the rights under the First Amendment and we will disallow taxpayer dollars from being used for that kind of art exhibit in New York City.

I hope my colleagues reconsider, but I know that their egos probably will not. So I hope that all my colleagues and their constituents remember that they do not have to and they should not be forced to pay with taxpayer dollars an art exhibit such as the one displaying the Virgin Mary with crap thrown all over it. Our country is greater than that, and our country stands for a lot more than that.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 764, CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION AND ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1999

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-363) on the resolution (H. Res. 321) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 764) to reduce the incidence of child abuse and neglect, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: REVISIONS TO ALLOCATION FOR HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS PURSUANT TO HOUSE REPORT 106-288

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Sec. 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD revisions to the allocation for the House Committee on Appropriations pursuant to House Report 106-288 to reflect \$8,699,000,000 in additional new budget authority and \$8,282,000,000 in additional outlays for emergencies. This will increase the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations to \$551,899,000,000 in budget authority and \$590,760,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2000.

As reported to the House, H.R. 1906, the conference report accompanying the bill making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for fiscal year 2000, includes \$8,699,000,000 in budget authority and \$8,282,000,000 in outlays for emergencies.

These adjustments shall apply while the legislation is under consideration and shall take effect upon final enactment of the legislation.

Questions may be directed to Art Sauer or Jim Bates at x6-7270.

HEALTH CARE REFORM: TREAT THE CAUSE, NOT THE SYMPTOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, as an M.D. I know that when I advise on medical legislation that I may be tempted to allow my emotional experience as a physician to influence my views. But, nevertheless, I am acting the role as legislator and politician.

The M.D. degree grants no wisdom as to the correct solution to our managed-care mess. The most efficient manner to deliver medical services, as it is with all goods and services, is determined by the degree the market is allowed to operate. Economic principles determine efficiencies of markets, even the medical care market, not our emotional experiences dealing with managed care.

Contrary to the claims of many advocates of increased government regulation of health care, the problems with the health care system do not represent market failure. Rather, they represent the failure of government policies which have destroyed the health care market.

In today's system, it appears on the surface that the interest of the patient is in conflict with the rights of the insurance companies and the Health Maintenance Organizations. In a free market, this cannot happen. Everyone's rights are equal and agreements on delivering services of any kind are entered into voluntarily, thus satisfying both sides.

Only true competition assures that the consumer gets the best deal at the best price possible by putting pressure on the providers. Once one side is given a legislative advantage in an artificial system, as it is in managed care, trying to balance government-dictated advantages between patient and HMOs is impossible. The differences cannot be reconciled by more government mandates, which will only make the problem worse. Because we are trying to patch up an unworkable system, the impasse in Congress should not be a surprise.

No one can take a back seat to me regarding the disdain I hold for the HMO's role in managed care. This entire unnecessary level of corporatism that rakes off profits and undermines